

Exhibit 1

OBJECTOR (counsel, if any)	NATURE OF OBJECTION(S)	REMEDY REQUESTED	INTENT TO APPEAR
Bacon	Objects to the lawsuit, not to the settlement	None	No
Bandas	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Attorneys' fee request too high 2. Unfair to allocate same award to each claimant 3. Mailing claim form for cash is burdensome 	Reject settlement Or Approve settlement with no award for attorneys' fees or costs	No
Cope (Darrell Palmer)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Notice inadequate – does not specify the amount of award claimants will receive 2. Out of pocket costs for travel and legal research are unreasonable 3. California state action counsel potential fees should not come out of fund; improper to share fees with state action counsel; 4. California state action counsel have to make any fee request prior to deadline for objections under <i>Mercury Interactive Corp. Sec. Litig.</i>, 618 F.3d 988 (9th Cir. 2010) 	Modify settlement agreement and award the objector an incentive fee and award objector's counsel attorneys' fees	Yes
Dolan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mailing claim form for cash is burdensome 2. Attorneys' fee request too high – fee request must be based on value of redeemed Gift Cards 	Reject settlement	Yes
Frank (pro per)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Attorneys' fee request too high -- disproportionate fees relative to the value of "coupon" benefit to class 	Reject settlement	Yes

OBJECTOR (counsel, if any)	NATURE OF OBJECTION(S)	REMEDY REQUESTED	INTENT TO APPEAR
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Gift Cards are “coupons” under CAFA, 28 U.S.C. § 1712(a), so Court must wait until Gift Cards are redeemed to determine percentage-of-the-fund attorneys’ fee award 3. Plaintiffs and defendant WalMart committed fraud on the Court to induce Court to preliminarily approve Settlement 4. Attorneys’ fee request too high –notice and administration costs cannot be included as part of the settlement fund 5. Mailing claim form for cash is burdensome 6. “Arbitration contingency” makes settlement unfair 	<p>Or</p> <p>Approve the settlement with reduction in award of fees and cost</p>	
Griffis / Bishop (Steve A. Miller, P.C.)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Claims ¶ 11.1.4 of Settlement Agreement is a “reverter” that renders the Settlement unfair 2. California State Action attorneys should not be permitted to request a fee, but if they do and are awarded a fee, it should come from Class Counsel’s 25% award 3. Incentive awards to named plaintiffs of \$5K each is too high 	<p>Strike ¶ 11.1.4 from Settlement Agreement</p> <p>Cap all attorneys’ fees at 25%</p> <p>Reduce incentive awards</p>	Yes
Griggs	Attorneys should receive no award of fees and no reimbursement of costs	No award of any attorneys’ fees or costs	No
Johnson	Objects to the lawsuit, not to the settlement	None	No
Kraska	Not an objection – requests court confirm the email notice is not a hoax	N/A	N/A

OBJECTOR (counsel, if any)	NATURE OF OBJECTION(S)	REMEDY REQUESTED	INTENT TO APPEAR
Kling Cox (Gary W. Sibley)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Objects to litigation class certification and settlement class certification for “lack of typicality” 2. Plan of allocation unfair because it treats all class members the same without regard to length of time of Netflix subscription 3. Attorneys’ fee request is too high 	Reject settlement	Yes – requests appearance by telephone
Kress	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Notice inadequate – does not state how much each claimant will receive 2. Gift Cards are not fair for those class members who do not like online shopping 3. Gift Card is inferior to cash 4. Mailing claim form for cash is a burden 5. Gift Cards have expiration dates 6. Gift Cards are unfair because user still must pay taxes and perhaps shipping 7. Attorneys’ fee request is too high 	No attorney fees should be awarded, or reduced amount	No
Kyriacos	Not an objection – requests to be “included in the lawsuit process”	N/A	No
Leach (pro se)	Resembles an exclusion, not an objection: “I am excluding myself from this lawsuit ... I reserve the right to file a subsequent small claims lawsuit in South Dakota ...”	None	No
Leimgruber	Not an objection – informs Court that she did not receive the email notice	N/A	No
Maine	Attorneys’ fee request is too high	None	No
Nehme	Attorneys’ fee request is too high	None	No

OBJECTOR (counsel, if any)	NATURE OF OBJECTION(S)	REMEDY REQUESTED	INTENT TO APPEAR
-------------------------------	------------------------	------------------	------------------

Nowacki	Objects to the litigation, not the settlement	None	No
Payne	Objects to the litigation, not the settlement Requests exclusion from “this class”	None	No
Pearson	Objects to the litigation, not the settlement	None	No
Perry/Cabot	Settlement amount insufficient to deter future similar collusion	None	No
Snider	Not an objection – requests Court confirm the email notice is not a scam or hoax	N/A	No
Sullivan (Mark T. Lavery; Christopher Langone; Grenville Pridham)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Gift Cards are “coupons” under CAFA, 28 U.S.C. § 1712(a), so Court must wait until Gift Cards are redeemed to determine percentage-of-the-fund attorneys’ fee award 2. Gift Cards do not have a guaranteed cash value and so violate National Association of Consumer Advocate (NACA) guidelines 3. Notice does not enable an informed opt-out decision in light of the development that Netflix prevailed on summary judgment, but where notice does not warn class members who opt out that Wal-Mart would likely argue <i>res judicata</i> based on the summary judgment ruling 4. Notice inadequately informed class of what the amount of the attorneys’ fee request would be 5. Claim form is confusing because it presents two boxes (one for Gift Card and one for Cash) but only one box is to be 	<p>Requests the settlement be altered to all cash, no Gift Cards</p> <p>Requests a hearing be scheduled for expert testimony on the “actual value” of redeemed Gift Cards</p> <p>Re-notice to class</p> <p>Provision of class counsel’s detailed time records OR reduce claimed lodestar to only those hours and amounts billed in connection with the</p>	Yes

OBJECTOR (counsel, if any)	NATURE OF OBJECTION(S)	REMEDY REQUESTED	INTENT TO APPEAR
	<p>checked</p> <p>6. Detailed time records were not submitted to support the fee petition</p> <p>7. Mailing claim form for cash is a burden</p> <p>8. Dual notice of litigation class and settlement class is confusing</p> <p>9. Attorneys' fee request too high – Class Counsel only spent 5% of its time on the settlement, while most of the other 95% of attorney time was spent on summary judgment and trial preparation, which was a losing effort</p>	settlement	
Taylor	Objects to the litigation, not the settlement	None	No
Tricome	Not an objection – requests Court “protect” the Class by scrutinizing the amounts claimed for attorneys’ fees and unreimbursed expenses	None	No
Webbink	An exclusion, not an objection: “I wish to be excluded from this settlement.”	None	No
Zimmerman (Joshua R. Furman Law Corp.)	<p>1. Notice by email was misleading – the “from” field on email does not say it is a legal notice, but says only “OnlineDVDclass.com”</p> <p>2. Claims ¶ 11.1.4 of Settlement Agreement is a “reverter” that renders the Settlement unfair</p>	Reject settlement	Yes

OBJECTOR (counsel, if any)	NATURE OF OBJECTION(S)	REMEDY REQUESTED	INTENT TO APPEAR
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Claims the mediation provision at ¶ 6.1.2.3 of Settlement Agreement is unfair 4. Settlement amount is inadequate 5. Unfair and unreasonable for class members to have to submit a claim 6. Claims California state court actions will continue against WalMart so this settlement is not binding 7. Unfair and unreasonable coupon settlement with no evidence of value of Gift Cards 		